



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

H.C.  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/786,802	04/18/2001	Hans Ruckert	21753	5223

535                  7590                  05/06/2003

THE FIRM OF KARL F ROSS  
5676 RIVERDALE AVENUE  
PO BOX 900  
RIVERDALE (BRONX), NY 10471-0900

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

HAMILTON, ISAAC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3724	11

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/786,802	RUCKERT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Isaac N Hamilton	3724

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_. *Alln*
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_. *Alln*
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

*Alln*  
**Allan N. Shoap**  
**Supervisory Patent Examiner**  
**Group 3700**

- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_. *Alln*
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_. *Alln*
- Claim(s) rejected: 17-24. *Alln*
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_. *Alln*
8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
  9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_. *Alln*
  10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The claims do not overcome the prior art, contrary to applicant's assertions. Applicant has not provided any relationship between the method and the formed web cutting apparatus. Indeed, the patent to DeTorre (5,423,240) teaches everything that is claimed and may, in fact, be formed using a plasma aided method. Certainly in the final product of applicant's invention we would not be sure of this either, and therefore the conclusion stated by the Examiner, supported by case law, supercedes the applicant's argument in this instance. In Re Fessman states that the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. Applicant has failed to provide evidence to show the difference between the two. See MPEP 2113 .